



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,198	08/27/2003	Panagiotis Kougiouris	11389-033	5126
20583	7590	08/24/2005	EXAMINER	
JONES DAY			NGUYEN, MAIKHANH	
222 EAST 41ST ST			ART UNIT	
NEW YORK, NY 10017			PAPER NUMBER	

2176

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/649,198	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KOUGIOURIS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Maikhanh Nguyen	<b>Art Unit</b> 2176	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2003.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/27/03 &amp; 3/7/05</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

*PD*

***DETAILED ACTION***

1. This action is responsive to communications: application filed on 08/27/2003, continuation filing date of 11/15/1999; IDS filed on 08/27/2003 and 03/07/2005.
2. Claims 1-19 are currently pending in this application. Claim 1 is independent claim.
3. Applicant is requested to supply the serial numbers of the related applications cited on page 1 of the specification.

***Specification***

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds the limit of 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ferris et al.** (U.S. 6,253,228, filed 03/1997) in view of **Strong** (U.S. 6,167,523, filed 05/1997). Ferris and Strong references were cited by Applicant's IDS, filed 08/27/2003.

**As to independent claim 1:**

- a. Ferris discloses a method for automatically validating text input, the method comprising:
- (i) an application processing a markup language file (*Fig.2*), wherein the markup language file comprises a description of a graphical user interface (*GUI; col.1, lines 38-47*), wherein the markup language file comprises a markup language tag for instantiating a validation manager component (*a hidden applet called the Applet Group Controller is created which handlers the communication between the applets and the server; col.4, lines 54-65*), wherein the description of the GUI comprises a description of a GUI element enabled to receive text input (*a Textfield Applet; col.10, lines 51-52*);
  - (ii) the application instantiating the validation manager component in response to said processing the markup language file (*applets that run on a client ...a Web page and can be programmed to produced an unlimited number of input mechanisms to a user; col.4, lines 47-53*);

- (iii) the application displaying the GUI on a display screen of a computer system in response to said processing the markup language file (*rerender the applet on the client's display ... by the browser; col.10, lines 1-10*);
  - (iv) providing text input (*various applets are provided to the user ... a text field permitting text input from a user; col.10, lines 48-67*) to the GUI element; and
  - (v) the validation manager component receiving a programmatic event in response to said providing text input to the GUI element (*Upon receiving invocation instructions from the instance of Association 302, Action Coordinator 301 queries Associations 302 for the values for all of their keys at step 604. The values retrieved are examined to determine whether the value has been changed since the last communication with the server 'e.g., the values retrieved are compared to the values in the dictionary'. If any values have changed, synchronization with the server takes place; col.14, lines 60-67*).
- b. However, Ferris, does not explicitly disclose:
- (i) the validation manager component determining whether the text input provided to the GUI element is valid text input in response to receiving the programmatic event; and
  - (ii) the validation manager component indicating that the text input provided to the GUI element is invalid if the validation manager component determines that the text input is not valid.

- c. Strong discloses:
- (i) the validation manager component determining whether the text input provided to the GUI element is valid text input in response to receiving the programmatic event *(If no invalid input data is identified, one or more data processing programs, are also referred to herein as "handlers," are invoked by the data validation and processing control program to process the input data; col.3, lines 44-47); and*
  - (ii) the validation manager component indicating that the text input provided to the GUI element is invalid if the validation manager component determines that the text input is not valid *(if the data in the field is invalid according to requirements specified in the one or more configuration registry keys, an error message corresponding to the field being evaluated is dynamically built and logged in an error log; col.3, lines 36-40).*
- d. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Strong with Ferris because it would have provided the capability for handling data validation in an information processing system.

**As to dependent claim 2:**

Ferris discloses an attribute for specifying a type associated with the GUI element, the method further comprising: the validation manager component instantiating a validation component, wherein said instantiating a validation component comprises specifying the type associated with the GUI element *(determines the appropriate action logic to invoke;*

*Fig.6A*); wherein said validation manager component determining whether the text input provided to the GUI element is valid text input comprises the validation manager component calling the validation component (*invoke action; Fig.6A*); wherein said validation manager component calling the validation component comprises the validation manager component specifying the text input provided to the GUI element; wherein the validation component is operable to return a result value to the validation manager component indicating whether the text input provided to the GUI element is valid text for the type associated with the GUI element (*transmit package to Applet Group Controller; Fig.6A*).

**As to dependent claim 3:**

Ferris discloses a user of the application providing text input to the GUI element (*various applets are provided to the user ... a text field permitting text input from a user; col.10, lines 48-67*).

**As to dependent claim 4:**

Ferris discloses the application providing text input to the GUI element (*various applets are provided to the user ... a text field permitting text input from a user; col.10, lines 48-67*).

**As to dependent claim 5:**

- a. Ferris does not explicitly disclose “*one or more attributes for specifying when text input to the GUI element should be validated; the validation manager component is operable to validate text input to the GUI element in accordance with the one*

*or more attributes specifying when text input to the GUI element should be validated.”*

- b. Strong discloses one or more attributes for specifying when text input to the GUI element should be validated; the validation manager component is operable to validate text input to the GUI element in accordance with the one or more attributes specifying when text input to the GUI element should be validated (*an HTML form that includes one or more fields for data input ... then the form can be validated by the forms data validation; col.3, lines 24-47*).
- c. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Strong with Ferris because it would have provided the capability for determining the validate data input from user.

**As to dependent claim 6:**

Ferris discloses each of the one or more attributes for specifying when text input to the GUI element should be validated corresponds to at least one type of programmatic event (*transmit changed values to association; Fig.6B*); said validation manager component receiving a programmatic event comprises the validation manager component ignoring the programmatic event if the programmatic event does not correspond to one of the attributes for specifying (*filter changed values; Fig.6A*) when text input to the GUI element should be validated.

**As to dependent claim 7:**



Ferris discloses performing one of the actions, among other things, from the group consisting of, clicking on the GUI element (*see the clicking of a button icon discussion beginning at col.13, line 49*); wherein said validation manager component receiving a programmatic event in response to said providing text input to the GUI element comprises the validation manager component receiving a programmatic event corresponding to the action performed (*Figs. 3 and 6A, in a preferred embodiment, upon the occurrence of an event ... the clicking of a button icon ...invoke the action; col.13, lines 49-59*).

**As to dependent claim 8:**

Ferris discloses one or more parameters (*Bind variables to keys and values; Fig.6A*) for specifying the default behavior of when the validation manager component should validate text input for GUI elements described in the markup language file.

**As to dependent claim 9:**

Ferris discloses the description of the GUI element enabled to receive text input comprises one or more attributes for specifying when text input to the GUI element should be validated; the validation manager component is operable to override the default behavior and validate text input to the GUI element in accordance with the one or more attributes specifying when text input to the GUI element should be validated (*transmit changed values to association, filter changed values; Fig.6B*).

**As to dependent claim 10:**

Ferris discloses said validation manager component indicating that the text input to provided to the GUI element is invalid comprises the validation manager requesting the

application to alter the visual appearance of the GUI element (*any state that has changed in the client... anything that action has caused to be changed, is reflected to the client for the user's viewing; col.10, lines 34-47*).

**As to dependent claim 11:**

Ferris discloses validation manager component indicating that the text input provided to the GUI element is invalid comprises the validation manager displaying an informational user interface window (*any state that has changed in the client... anything that action has caused to be changed, is reflected to the client for the user's viewing; col.10, lines 34-47*).

**As to dependent claim 12:**

Ferris discloses one or more attributes for controlling text input validation for the GUI element; the application constructing a document object representing the markup language file; the application passing a reference to the document object to the validation manager component; wherein, in response to being instantiated by and receiving the reference to the document object from the application, the validation manager component is operable to traverse the document object in order to discover the one or more attributes for controlling text input validation for the GUI element (*transmit package to Apple Group Controller; Fig.6A*).

**As to dependent claim 13:**

Ferris discloses the one or more attributes for controlling text input validation for the GUI element include an attribute for specifying a type associated with the GUI element (*a string capitalizer; col.9, lines 51-60*).

**As to dependent claim 14:**

Ferris discloses the one or more attributes for controlling text input validation for the GUI element includes one or more attributes for specifying when text input to the GUI element should be validated (*determines the appropriate action logic to invoke; Fig.6A*).

**As to dependent claim 15:**

- a. Ferris does not explicitly disclose the one or more attributes for controlling text input validation for the GUI element include one or more attributes for specifying how invalid text input for the GUI element should be indicated.
- b. Strong discloses the one or more attributes for controlling text input validation for the GUI element include one or more attributes for specifying how invalid text input for the GUI element should be indicated (*if the data in the field is invalid according to requirements specified in the one or more configuration registry keys, an error message corresponding to the field being evaluated is dynamically built and logged in an error log; col.3, lines 36-40*).
- c. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Strong with Ferris because it would have provided the capability for handling validation of input data.

**As to dependent claim 17:**

Ferris discloses the validation manager component is a Java object (*The applets can be written using a programming language such as Java; col.6, lines 26-43*).

**As to dependent claim 18:**

Ferris discloses the markup language is HTML (*HTML; col.4, lines 41-53 & col.6, line 66- col.7, line 8*).

**As to dependent claim 19:**

Ferris discloses (*the information collected on a form ...CITY/HOUSTON; col.3, lines 61-67*) the type associated with the GUI element is a type from the group consisting of: Coordination of Benefits code, Current Procedural Terminology, HCFA Common Procedure Coding System code, International Classification of Diseases code, U.S. Employer Information Number , U.S. Social Security Number, currency, U.S. states and territories, telephone number, zip code, data, and Boolean.

7. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ferris et al.** in view of **Strong** as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Microsoft Corporation**, "Microsoft Component Services: Server Operating System A Technology Overview" (last updated August, 15 1998).

**As to dependent claim 16:**

- a. The combination of Ferris and Strong do not explicitly disclose "the validation manager component is a COM object."
- b. Microsoft discloses the validation manager component is a COM object (*COM makes it easy to develop powerful component-base application; page 2, last first paragraph*).

- c. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Microsoft with Ferris as modified by Strong because it would have provided the capability for implementing an efficient means to validate data in an information processing system.

*Conclusion*

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Bahrs et al. U.S Patent No. 6,782,508 issued dated: Aug. 24, 2004

Bahrs et al. U.S Patent No. 6,680,126 issued dated: Apr. 12, 2005

Hoogenboom et al. U.S Patent No. 6,874,025 issued dated: Mar. 29, 2005

Bahrs et al U.S Patent No. 6,901,554 issued dated: May 31, 2005

P. Henderson et al., "System Design Validation Using Formal Models", IEEE International Workshop on 16-18 June 1999, pp.1-5.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MN

*William J. Bashore*  
WILLIAM BASHORE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
*8/21/2005*